

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY / MIDDLE EAST UPDATE
July 20 - 26, 2012

1. [Ambassador Benjamin on Global Counterterrorism Cooperation](#) (07-25-2012)
 2. [Ambassador DeLaurentis at U.N. Debate on Middle East](#) (07-25-2012)
 3. [Clinton Condemns Mass Atrocities, Genocide](#) (07-24-2012)
 4. [Carter Urges Closer U.S.-India Defense Cooperation](#) (07-23-2012)
 5. [U.S. Pledges Continuing Humanitarian Support for Syrians](#) (07-20-2012)
 6. [Obama on Taking the Cyberattack Threat Seriously](#) (07-20-2012)
-

1. [Ambassador Benjamin on Global Counterterrorism Cooperation](#) (07-25-2012)

U.S. Department of State

*Remarks by Daniel Benjamin, Coordinator, Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism
Washington, DC, July 24, 2012*

Remarks at the Center on Global Counterterrorism Cooperation

Thank you, Alistair, for the kind introduction and for organizing this timely event. A big thank you for all that you and your Center have done over the last six or seven years to promote multilateral counterterrorism cooperation.

Last week's horrific terrorist attack in Bulgaria, which killed a Bulgarian and five Israeli citizens, is just the most recent reminder of the global nature of the terrorist threat – no country is immune from it.

It also serves as another reminder that effective international cooperation, whether among police, policymakers, prosecutors, judges, border officials, or others, is essential both in responding to these attacks and preventing future ones.

I am particularly grateful for the opportunity to speak here today about some of the work that we have done at the State Department over the past three years to strengthen the international counterterrorism apparatus. This includes not only creating the Global Counterterrorism Forum (GCTF) but fine tuning the existing bodies. In both cases, among the key objectives has been to

ensure the necessary international architecture is in place to allow us to pursue our long-term, civilian-focused counterterrorism objectives most effectively.

Secretary Clinton came into office with a strong conviction that we needed a more comprehensive counterterrorism policy and that there was an important diplomatic role to be played. She believed strongly that it was not just a question of taking out the terrorists who were threatening us at any given moment, but that over the long term, we also needed to diminish recruitment, which the terrorists of course rely upon, and help others to do a better job defending themselves against the threats within their borders and in their regions.

You've heard her speak at great length about smart power. We very much consider this to be a smart power approach. We could call it strategic counterterrorism. And its core elements involve countering violent extremism, undermining the ideology of al-Qaida and other extremist groups, and building the capacity of civilian and other rule of law institutions in countries so that they address threats within their own borders regions.

Doing so reduces the burden on American taxpayers; builds partnerships and enables countries to put in place and use rule of law institutions/framework to prevent and counter terrorism, thus reducing the likelihood of US intervention, which unfortunately has proven to be significant radicalizer, historically.

To make real progress in advancing this strategic agenda at the global level there was a strong sense that we needed the international community – in particular its CT policymakers and practitioners – to come together in a way that it had never done before to build counterterrorism capacities, to share expertise and good practices, and develop innovative solutions.

Over the years the UN had done a commendable job in elaborating a normative international counterterrorism framework and some of its secretariat bodies, in particular Mike Smith and his CTED colleagues, do excellent work with countries to advance its implementation on the ground. However, the tendency of the governmental bodies within the global organization to return to the sterile debate about who is a terrorist and the emphasis in New York on process and politics rather than action left us thinking that the UN was not the ideal venue to serve as the centerpiece for advancing our strategic counterterrorism priorities at a global level.

With the terrorist threat spreading to new regions, and in order to advance our long-term, strategic counterterrorism goals, we needed a multilateral forum that could bring together Western donors, Muslim majority partners and emerging powers; one that emphasized results over rhetoric. Our aim with the GCTF was to establish an apolitical, technical body, where CT policymakers and practitioners could come together to set priorities, mobilize resources and do the essential work of assisting our partners to become more capable.

The need for this body was all the more urgent because of the Arab Awakening. Suddenly, a key group of new governments wanted to get away from the repressive practices that drove radicalization for more than a generation. We didn't want to miss this opportunity to help shape the future.

The 30- member Forum, which grew out of the G8's Counterterrorism Action Group, was officially launched by Secretary Clinton and her Turkish counterpart last September on the margins of the UN General Assembly and held its second ministerial meeting last month in Istanbul. The continuing high-level political commitment from so many of its members is a demonstration that the Forum is an idea whose time has come.

In its short life, the Forum has already demonstrated the value of having a dedicated global venue to regularly convene CT policymakers and practitioners from around the world to address some of the critical counterterrorism challenges of today and tomorrow, including in its two areas of strategic priority: strengthening rule of law institutions so that countries are better able to address the security threats within their own borders and regions – while respecting human rights and reducing terrorist recruitment by countering the political, economic, and social drivers of violent extremism.

A quick run through the various cities in which the Forum has met since its September launch is just one indication of the breadth of countries that have stepped forward to support the GCTF mission -- Abu Dhabi, Algiers, Istanbul, London, Washington, Niamey, Madrid, Dar es Salaam, Rabat, Semarang, Rome, and The Hague. We expect this list to grow in the months ahead as other GCTF members and non-members step forward to host GCTF activities.

The GCTF has already established itself as an action-oriented organization – one that has surpassed expectations.

It has elaborated and endorsed rule of law-based CT good practices for criminal justice officials and for how to develop prison rehabilitation and reintegration programs for violent extremist offenders. It has raised more than \$150 million for capacity-building projects to strengthen rule of law institutions, with a particular focus on countries transitioning away from emergency law as the basis for fighting terrorism. We are seeing an increasing number of GCTF members align their civilian CT capacity-building resources with GCTF thematic and geographic priorities.

Thanks to the GCTF, the first-ever, international rule of law training center will soon be established where the Arab Awakening began – Tunisia – which will provide human rights-based CT training to criminal justice officials in countries in North Africa and the broader Middle East.

We recognize that this Institute will not be the first actor to engage in this region on these issues. However, while a number of bilateral and multilateral actors are delivering rule of law-related counterterrorism training in the Middle East and North Africa region, much of this is done as one-off workshops and/or on an ad hoc basis and is thus often not geared to the longer-term, sustainable training that could be delivered from and by the Institute.

This will complement the first-ever International Center of Excellence on Countering Violent Extremism, which the UAE agreed to host, with the support of the GCTF, and is set to open this fall. Its international experts, who will be drawn from governments, academia and NGOs around the world, will provide, long-term, sustainable training to government officials on how to develop programs and tools to counter violent extremism at home and abroad.

Much like the Tunisia center, this CVE center was inspired by and driven by the agenda of the GCTF. Also, much like the Tunisia center and the GCTF as a whole, the Abu Dhabi center will have a close partnership with the UN, including by offering a platform for relevant UN entities to deliver CVE training and host CVE workshops.

All of this is not only going to provide us a more dynamic, strategically and practically-oriented multilateral counterterrorism architecture, but it is going to pay real security dividends for the U.S. and its partners.

With the Forum soon entering its second year of existence, we are accurately aware that its impact should not be limited just to its members; maximizing its impact will require contributions from and

developing partnerships with non-members and this includes states, multilateral bodies, and civil society.

The GCTF has already made important strides here. It has already developed a close working relationship with the United Nations, and regional bodies as it strives to promote the implementation of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. A wide range of UN entities have participated in GCTF activities and have contributed to the elaboration of GCTF good practices. We are also particularly pleased to see how the Forum has been able to mobilize additional resources for UN capacity-building projects in areas of strategic priority for both the Forum and the UN, some of which I am sure Mike will address in his remarks.

We have also seen key counterterrorism partners from the Sahel, the Horn of Africa, and Southeast Asia, countries who are not members of the Forum, participate in Forum activities. In fact, in May, Niger (a non-member) hosted a productive GCTF meeting that brought together border security experts from all Sahel countries and GCTF members to build working-level partnerships and identify how best to secure the borders in the region. We are committed to continue to find ways to involve non-member states in the work Forum and demonstrate that despite its limited membership the GCTF is truly committed to strengthening global civilian CT capacities and cooperation.

The Forum has also made progress in engaging with and involving regional and other international organizations. So far, experts from a diversity of regional bodies have participated in GCTF activities to learn how they can take best advantage of the expertise and resources that the GCTF can mobilize.

Before turning the floor over to Mike, I wanted to underscore that although our efforts with the GCTF may attract the most attention, we remain very active in a wide range of other multilateral fora, whether at the UN or at the regional level. Our efforts have focused on how we can leverage these organizations to increase the political will and the capacities of countries around the world to counter terrorism. Wherever appropriate, we have sought to work with partners to reorient the work of these bodies towards our strategic counterterrorism priorities.

For example, we are increasingly turning to the UN to deliver counterterrorism capacity-building assistance, including in politically sensitive regions such as South Asia, the Horn of Africa, and North Africa, and on potentially sensitive topics. This recognizes not only the growing expertise that the UN is developing, but that in many instances engagement under the UN flag is likely to be more productive, better received and far reaching than providing it bilaterally. We are particularly pleased with two innovative projects: one that will allow the UN for the first time to be able to deliver counterterrorism-related human rights training to law enforcement officials in key regions around the globe, and the other will allow the UN to work with prison officials to develop rule of law-based programs aimed at rehabilitating violent extremists. Both of these initiatives will pay particular attention to countries transitioning away from the use of repressive counterterrorism tactics and other front-line countries.

At the regional level, our efforts have traditionally focused on those bodies in which the U.S. is a member. Thus, for example, we spearheaded the creation of an APEC Consolidated Counter-Terrorism and Secure Trade Strategy, with the objective of making regional commerce and travel more secure, efficient, and resilient and will now work within APEC to bring together experts from a range of sectors, such as aviation, maritime, customs, and border protection to support its implementation. This complements the work we have done in recent years within APEC to build the capacity of our APEC partners to secure transportation and trade and counter terrorism financing, among others. This week in Manila, for example, we're hosting a training workshop on Bus

Security as it pertains to information sharing, capacity building, and public awareness. As we saw last week in Bulgaria, this is an area of critical importance.

At the OSCE, by applying its signature concept of comprehensive security and utilizing the multiple dimensions of the organization, we are seeking to expand CT cooperation and capacity-building with Central Asia and Afghanistan. This includes by helping to develop and fund projects to promote the rule of law and counter violent extremism and radicalization.

Finally, we continue to work closely with OAS/CICTE on strengthening CT cooperation and capacities in the Western Hemisphere and capacity building and provide funds for workshops on a diverse range of subjects to strengthen the capacity of our partners in the region, to include, cyber security, aviation security, travel document security, and bulk cash smuggling.

By working through regional organizations such as the OAS, we've built security partnerships that would not exist otherwise. For example, we expect the US-funded, OAS-delivered bulk cash smuggling training to result in a joint interdiction operation for the Southern Cone countries of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay and, if successful, it could be considered an international breakthrough on international cooperation against bulk currency smuggling as a means to launder money and finance terrorism.

There is obviously a great deal more that could be said about our efforts to strengthen the international counterterrorism architecture... as I have just skimmed the surface of what we are doing to implement a central pillar of the U.S. National Counterterrorism Strategy.

I look forward to your questions.

2. Ambassador DeLaurentis at U.N. Debate on Middle East (07-25-2012)

Remarks by Ambassador Jeffrey DeLaurentis, Alternate Representative of the United States for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, At a Security Council Open Debate on the Middle East, July 25, 2012

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Special Coordinator Serry, for your briefing.

Mr. President, last week the world witnessed – and the Security Council appropriately condemned – a heinous terrorist attack in Bulgaria. The target was innocent Israeli tourists on vacation in the Black Sea. Five Israelis and one Bulgarian were murdered and scores more were injured, including citizens of Bulgaria, Italy, Slovakia, and the United States. There is no justification whatsoever for such attacks against innocent people. We extend our heartfelt condolences to the victims and their families and to the people of Israel, Bulgaria, and all those whose citizens were harmed in this awful event.

Turning to Syria, this Council has failed to respond credibly to the Assad regime's onslaught because of the vetoes of two members of the Council, the most recent last week. As Ambassador Rice said after last Thursday's vote: "The Security Council has failed utterly in its most important task on its agenda this year." It is our hope, as she also said then, that the day will come when this Council can assume its proper role at the center of the international response to the conflict in Syria.

We continue to see a grave escalation of the regime's attacks against its own people that continues to spread instability well beyond Syria's borders. As we saw with incidents over the weekend, the

regime is losing its grip over increasingly large swathes of the country. The Syrian opposition now controls several crossings on the Iraqi and Turkish borders. This is increasing evidence that the Assad regime will not remain in power. And since this Council has failed to shoulder its responsibilities, the United States will continue to work with the Friends of the Syrian People to increase pressure on the regime, support the Syrian opposition, marshal relief for the Syrian people, and help prepare for a Syrian-led, democratic transition.

We are deeply concerned by the July 18-19 incident in UNDOF's area of operation, as described in DPKO's letter to the Council last week, in which nearly 500 armed soldiers from the Syrian Arab Armed Forces entered the area of separation. In the past six months, Syria has committed multiple violations of the key provisions of the 1974 agreement that led to the establishment of UNDOF, but the July incident constitutes the gravest breach in the nearly 40-year history of the agreement. We strongly condemn all violations of the Disengagement Agreement. These violations must cease immediately.

The ongoing violence in Syria continues to put pressure on all of Syria's neighbors to support dramatic increases in the number of refugees. We thank those countries for providing the refugees with safe harbor. UNHCR estimates that on July 18 and 19 alone, 18,000 Syrians fled across the border into Lebanon—meaning that in just two days, the estimated number of refugees in Lebanon increased nearly 60 percent. Overall, 117,000 Syrian refugees have registered with UNHCR in Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, and Turkey. This has become a humanitarian crisis. The United States has provided \$64 million during the current fiscal year to address the needs of those displaced by violence, and we urge other donors to provide support.

Let me also reiterate what President Obama said Monday about one of the most worrisome aspects of the Syria crisis: the regime has now acknowledged stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons. President Assad and those around him have been duly warned that the world is watching and that they will be held accountable should the regime make the grievous mistake of using such weapons.

Mr. President, Lebanon has been particularly hard hit by Assad's aggression. Syrian military forces have repeatedly shelled Lebanese territory, resulting in civilian deaths in several locations. We condemn these acts and demand that the Syrian regime cease these egregious violations of Lebanon's sovereignty. As reiterated in this Council's July 19 press statement, the international community is unified in its demand that Lebanon's sovereignty, unity, and territorial integrity and the authority of the Lebanese state must be respected in accordance with Security Council resolutions.

Despite these destabilizing external dynamics, Lebanese President Sleiman continues to press ahead with National Dialogue talks, an initiative we welcome. We support the efforts of Lebanese political leaders to remain focused on maintaining calm, including safeguarding Lebanon from the effects of the crisis in neighboring Syria. In addition, we welcomed Prime Minister Mikati's June 11 announcement that the Government of Lebanon fulfilled its 2012 funding obligation to the Special Tribunal for Lebanon.

Now, I will turn to our shared goals related to comprehensive Middle East peace. During Secretary of State Clinton's recent trip, she met separately with President Abbas and Prime Minister Netanyahu and reinforced the message that the United States supports the parties' continued engagement based on the leaders' exchange of letters earlier this year. She underscored our view that the status quo is unsustainable. She reiterated that our goal remains an independent Palestinian state living in peace and security alongside a Jewish democratic state of Israel.

During her visit, Secretary Clinton stated publically, "...it is only through negotiation, not through international venues or unilateral acts, that peace can be, and will be, secured." We believe that unilateral actions harm the peace process and only entrench both sides. The use of international fora to force decisions on final status issues that must be resolved directly by the parties does nothing to tangibly improve the daily lives of Palestinians nor foster the trust between the parties needed to make progress toward a two-state solution. It is incumbent upon both parties to discontinue unilateral actions that jeopardize efforts to achieve peace.

The United States reiterates that it does not accept the legitimacy of continued settlement activity and opposes any effort to legalize settlement outposts. As we work to put the parties back on the path of direct negotiations, we must also address the realities on the ground. The international community, along with the Palestinian people, has invested a great deal in the Palestinian Authority's institution-building efforts. Sustaining that effort is now in jeopardy, as the Palestinian Authority faces its worst financial crisis ever. Israel, the donor community, and the Palestinian leadership are all taking steps to address that crisis, but the financial gap remains large and the consequences of failing to close that gap are severe. More needs to be done now to avoid a collapse of the institutions so vital to providing for the daily needs, governance, and security of the residents of the West Bank.

We should also all focus our support on UNRWA, particularly in this time of financial crisis for that Agency. UNRWA is providing essential services to the Palestinian refugee population in the West Bank, Gaza, Lebanon, Jordan, and—it is important to remember—in Syria. UNRWA is providing education for over 485,000 schoolchildren, primary health care in 138 clinics, and social services for the most vulnerable Palestinian refugees, particularly in Lebanon and Gaza.

Before concluding, let me reiterate that any further rocket fire on southern Israel from Gaza is simply unacceptable. We remind members of the paralyzing effect these attacks have on the lives of innocent Israelis and the threat they pose to the peace process and to the region, generally. The international community must stand united in opposition to such threats.

Thank you, Mr. President.

3. Clinton Condemns Mass Atrocities, Genocide (07-24-2012)

By Merle David Kellerhals Jr.
Staff Writer

Washington — President Obama has made preventing mass atrocities and genocide a core U.S. national security interest as well as a significant moral responsibility, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says.

Speaking at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington July 24, Clinton said, "These crimes undermine stability in countries and across regions. They spark humanitarian crises and send refugees streaming across borders."

Mass atrocities and genocide also reverse economic progress and stymie growth for generations; they create cycles of often bitter vengeance and retribution that can scar communities for decades, Clinton said.

"If a government cannot or will not protect its own citizens, then the United States and like-minded partners must act," Clinton said. However, she added, that is not a call for military force, which must remain an action of last resort.

“In most cases, other tools will be more appropriate, through diplomacy, financial sanctions, humanitarian assistance, law enforcement measures,” she said.

Clinton was the featured speaker at a meeting called “Imagine the Unimaginable: A Symposium on Ending Genocide in the 21st Century” that is being held at the Holocaust Memorial Museum. One of the roles of the museum is to bring together scholars, academics, activists and other leaders in an effort to counter hatred and genocide among all peoples of the world through educational initiatives and symposiums.

Why the United States has acted to contain the violence in mass atrocities and genocide, and prevent even more terror, is not a difficult question to answer, Clinton said, but deciding when and how to act is difficult. That’s important because there is no one solution that works in every case; each situation requires a customized response, she said.

Clinton said the United States is developing several approaches to addressing the problem, including placing new emphasis on preventive measures, and is seeking to expand the range of partners to contribute to this cause because no single country can be effective alone. She noted that the U.S. response is based on a whole-of-government response, from the intelligence community to diplomacy.

One effort under way is training U.S. diplomats surveying at-risk countries to understand the warning signs, to provide accurate assessments of emerging crises, and to begin taking the first steps to prevent further violence, she said. Another part of the work involves putting technology to work in prevention efforts because technology has changed the way diplomats can detect and respond to mass atrocities.

Clinton said the U.S. State Department already has personnel trained to analyze conflicts and defuse potentially violent situations, but now those personnel will begin focusing on atrocity prevention. The United States has dispatched civilian response teams to countries across the globe in response to crises.

“We hope to train new teams to assess conditions on the ground, work with local governments to detect signs of impending atrocities, work with the local civil society and others who are representing populations at risk, and make recommendations to American officials on what we can do to prevent conflict,” Clinton said.

The United States also is deploying new tools through its National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, because women are often the first to know when their communities are in danger, she said.

Clinton said the United States can pressure those who organize atrocities and cut off the resources they need to continue their violence. The United States is working to deter atrocities by making it clear that those who commit these crimes will be held accountable.

“We need to expand the circle of partners who can help prevent and respond to crises, because a problem of this scale takes the skills and resources of governments, the private sector and civil society all working together,” Clinton said.

Despite all that has been learned about mass atrocities and genocide, and all that has been accomplished in trying to halt it in the last 70 years, “never again” remains an unmet, urgent goal, Clinton added.

Clinton's Remarks at Symposium on Genocide Prevention

4. Carter Urges Closer U.S.-India Defense Cooperation (07-23-2012)

By Karen Parrish
American Forces Press Service

NEW DELHI, July 23, 2012 – Deputy Defense Secretary Ashton B. Carter today offered what he called “practical steps” to improve U.S.-India defense cooperation.

During remarks at an event hosted here by the Confederation of Indian Industry, Carter noted President Barack Obama has called the two nations’ relationship “one of the defining partnerships of the 21st century,” adding that defense cooperation is central to that tie.

India, along with Brazil, Russia and China, is one of the “Big Four,” or BRIC, nations that economists have identified as being at a similar level of recently advanced economic development. Carter said partnership with India is a key part of the U.S. strategic emphasis on the Asia-Pacific region and its focus on broader security and prosperity.

“You are an economic power with an increasing military capability,” the deputy secretary said. “Your leadership in civil discourse and democracy is critical to the political stability of South Asia, and a beacon to the world.”

The United States and India have built their military-to-military engagement steadily through dialogues, exercises, defense trade and research cooperation, Carter noted. He added that U.S. defense leaders want to expand that linkage even further.

“We want to develop a joint vision for U.S.-India defense cooperation,” he said. “That’s why I’m here, at the request of Secretary of Defense Leon E. Panetta.”

U.S. defense leaders’ goal is to strengthen the relationship, Carter said, “to get to a place where we discover new opportunities continuously, making new and innovative investments that benefit both countries for generations to come.”

“We want to knock down any remaining bureaucratic barriers in our defense relationship, and strip away the impediments,” he added. “And we want to set big goals to achieve.”

The deputy secretary noted the United States has begun to prune back bureaucratic restrictions hindering defense trade and joint development between the two countries. The United States’ export control system is designed to prevent high-end technology from getting to states that shouldn’t have it, Carter noted.

“But our system can be confusing, rigid, and controls too many items for the wrong reasons,” he added. “We know we need to improve it,” and the president’s 2010 Export Control Reform initiative is guiding those improvements, he said.

The Defense Department's internal procedures also can erect barriers, the deputy secretary acknowledged. He added that he and Panetta are committed to reforming those processes. For example, he said, the United States has moved India's Defense Research and Development Organization and the Indian Space Research Organization off the Commerce Department's entity list. The list sets restrictions on foreign end-user nations involved in proliferation activities.

"We trust India and know that India is not a re-exporter or exploiter of our technologies," Carter said.

U.S. leaders consider India a top priority in the nation's export considerations, and want the United States to be India's "highest-quality and most trusted long-term supplier of technology – not a simple seller of goods -- in such fields as maritime domain awareness, counterterrorism, and many others," the deputy secretary said. In addition, he said, the United States is committed to India's military modernization.

Even as they work to increase bureaucratic speed, Carter said, U.S. defense leaders also are taking a more strategic approach to export decisions.

"We're making decisions more anticipatory, looking at what partners are likely to want in the future, and beginning our thinking and processes earlier," he said. "In a terrific new initiative, we're building exportability into our systems from the start, so it doesn't consume time and money to do it later."

U.S. leaders also are fast-tracking priority sales, Carter said.

"All these steps will be felt here in New Delhi. ... These and other efforts will help us respond more rapidly to India's requests for U.S. equipment and systems – particularly for more advanced technologies," the deputy secretary told Indian defense industry representatives.

Defense Department leaders also are working to improve the Foreign Military Sales program, or FMS, he said.

"India was our second-largest FMS customer in 2011, with 4 and a half billion dollars in total FMS transactions," he noted. "And we delivered six C-130J's on time." The C-130J, produced by Lockheed Martin, is the "Super Hercules" four-engine military transport aircraft.

"We think our defense technology is the best quality on the market. ... Buying American, whether through direct commercial sales or Foreign Military Sales, will get India exceptionally high-quality technology, a high degree of transparency, and no corruption," Carter said.

Defense leaders also are working to make their acquisition process clearer and more export-friendly, he added.

"I used to be undersecretary of defense for acquisition, technology and logistics," he said. "There was a chart on my wall, outlining the 250 ... steps it takes to move a program from development to delivery. It read like hieroglyphics."

The department is working to make that system more export-friendly, and also has a new fund that allows the Pentagon to procure long-lead, high-demand items in anticipation of partner nations' requests, he said. Officials also have developed a cadre of acquisition experts to help other countries define their requests and to streamline DOD's response, he noted.

“That should help India significantly,” Carter added.

The deputy secretary said most importantly, DOD leaders want to move beyond defense trade, toward cooperative research, development and co-production with India.

“I’m a scientist,” said Carter, who holds a doctorate in theoretical physics from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar. “I know this is the critical part.”

Carter noted he will travel south tomorrow from New Delhi to Hyderabad, India’s technology corridor. There, he said, he will visit the facilities where India’s Tata Advanced Systems Limited and Lockheed soon will begin producing parts for the C-130J.

“From now on, every [C-130J] around the world will contain parts made in Hyderabad,” he added. “That’s an example of the kind of co-production that is the future. It highlights what can be achieved when we unleash the potential of our private industries. It shows what’s possible when there’s a common strategic view, when the bureaucratic barriers are down, and importantly, when our strategic interests and genuine economic and business interests are aligned.”

Carter said such joint efforts can and should expand further. “The only question for us is: Where does India want to expand and grow?” he added.

India also is adapting its bureaucratic processes for the global marketplace, the deputy secretary said.

“We want to cooperate with you on high-value technologies,” Carter said. “To get where we both want to be, India can make some changes too, to increase U.S. investment.”

If India raises its foreign direct investment ceiling to international standards, he said, commercial incentives to invest would be greater. India currently limits foreign investment in its defense sector to 25 percent. A Washington-based nonprofit research group, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, recommended in a report last week that India increase its defense FDI cap to above 50 percent.

"An arrangement where U.S. companies invest in the Indian defense industry could provide a win-win for both the United States and India by improving India's defense industry while providing U.S. companies a potential source of lower-cost manufacturing for defense products," the report's authors wrote.

Carter said the Indian government also could adjust offset agreements to increase U.S investment opportunities. Offset agreements typically involve a foreign supplier agreeing to buy products from a government acting as buyer, to offset the buyer's investment.

“Offsets can be tremendously helpful to growing industry capabilities – if you have the right companies, and the right absorptive capacity,” Carter said. “If offsets are calibrated correctly, they work. But if offset requirements are too onerous or too narrow, they deter a company’s interest, and you lose that alignment of economic interest and strategic intent. For companies to participate, our arrangements must make good economic sense as well as good strategic sense.”

Third, he said, projects integrating technology development, production and acquisition require administrative structures that can accomplish that integration, he said.

Foreign direct investment limits, offset agreement restrictions and integrative administration structures are “just three points where change could be a real help in Indian-American cooperation,” the deputy secretary said.

“The point is that on both sides we need to change, reform, and push ourselves to get to a place where U.S.-India defense relations are only limited by our thinking, not by our capacity to cooperate,” Carter said.

Cooperation is the norm in technology and industry, he said.

“The leaders of industry globally, such as those in this room, know that,” the deputy secretary added. “Sometimes, we in the security community lag behind them in our ability to cooperate and advance technology.”

Carter’s visit to India is part of a 10-day Asia-Pacific tour that has included stops in Hawaii, Guam, Japan and Thailand. The deputy secretary will conclude the tour with a trip to South Korea later this week.

Biographies:
[Ashton B. Carter](#)

Related Sites:
[Special Report: Travels With Carter](#)
[State Department Background Note: India](#)
[Carter Describes Asia-Pacific Strategy in New Delhi](#)

5. U.S. Pledges Continuing Humanitarian Support for Syrians (07-20-2012)

By MacKenzie C. Babb
Staff Writer

Washington — The United States is working closely with Syria’s neighbors to support the estimated 140,000 Syrians who have fled the country's ongoing violence, according to Under Secretary of State Maria Otero.

She spoke in a telephone briefing on U.S. humanitarian aid for Syria July 19, shortly after her trip to Syria’s neighbors Turkey and Jordan.

She said the “alarming events” in Syria are “continuing to evolve even at a faster speed, raising huge and deep concerns for all the countries in the region” as well as for the international community.

The country has been embroiled in violent conflict since March 2011, when Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad launched brutal crackdowns on political opponents that have now left more than 14,000 people dead.

Kelly Clements, deputy assistant secretary of state for population, refugees and migration, said in the briefing that the violence is continuing to grow and that more and more Syrians are crossing borders every day seeking safety.

"In the course of just one night, nearly 1,300 Syrians arrived at Turkish camps," Clements said, adding that there are reports that more than 8,500 Syrians crossed the border into Lebanon in the 24 hours before the briefing.

"For this reason, our support is crucial to ensuring that basic needs are met," she said.

Clements said the governments of Syrian neighbors Turkey, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon have taken on a significant financial burden in providing shelter, medical care, food and water to refugees.

"We commend them for their generosity," Clements said, "but they are not alone."

She said the United States is providing an additional \$6 million to bolster the humanitarian response to the crisis.

"This brings the total amount of U.S. assistance in 2012 to nearly \$64 million, and more is coming," Clements said.

She said the aid is being delivered largely through international organizations with staff and infrastructure in Syria and neighboring countries.

"Humanitarian assistance is provided on the basis of need, not political affiliation, and is being distributed to the most vulnerable through United Nations agencies and other international and local nongovernmental organizations working together," including the Syrian Arab Red Crescent, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the U.N. Children's Fund, the World Food Programme, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, the U.N. Relief and Works Agency, and other international and local nongovernmental organizations.

Clements said lack of access due to violence is keeping humanitarian agencies from reaching those in need, and called for all parties to facilitate access for relief workers to reach affected areas and populations.

Mark Bartolini, director of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, said there are "really heroic efforts going on right now inside of Syria to help people that are most in need," and that these efforts are having a positive impact. He said in the briefing that there are an estimated 1.5 million Syrians in need still in the country, including between 300,000 and 500,000 who have been displaced from their homes.

"We're not reaching everyone, but we're doing the best we can and we're hopeful that we'll be able to get further access as the situation moves forward," Bartolini said.

Otero said the United States is working with international agencies as well as government leaders across the region to expand humanitarian aid because as the violence increases, more and more Syrians are expected to flee.

"We will continue our support for those affected by the violence in Syria even as we look forward to the day when all Syrians can live in a free and democratic country," Clements said.

[U.S. Envoy Rice on Syria at U.N.](#) (07-20-2012)

6. Obama on Taking the Cyberattack Threat Seriously (07-20-2012)

This op-ed by President Obama was originally published in the [The Wall Street Journal](#) on July 19.

Taking the Cyberattack Threat Seriously

By President Obama

Last month I convened an emergency meeting of my cabinet and top homeland security, intelligence and defense officials. Across the country trains had derailed, including one carrying industrial chemicals that exploded into a toxic cloud. Water treatment plants in several states had shut down, contaminating drinking water and causing Americans to fall ill.

Our nation, it appeared, was under cyber attack. Unknown hackers, perhaps a world away, had inserted malicious software into the computer networks of private-sector companies that operate most of our transportation, water and other critical infrastructure systems.

Fortunately, last month's scenario was just a simulation — an exercise to test how well federal, state and local governments and the private sector can work together in a crisis. But it was a sobering reminder that the cyber threat to our nation is one of the most serious economic and national security challenges we face.

So far, no one has managed to seriously damage or disrupt our critical infrastructure networks. But foreign governments, criminal syndicates and lone individuals are probing our financial, energy and public safety systems every day. Last year, a water plant in Texas disconnected its control system from the Internet after a hacker posted pictures of the facility's internal controls. More recently, hackers penetrated the networks of companies that operate our natural-gas pipelines. Computer systems in critical sectors of our economy—including the nuclear and chemical industries—are being increasingly targeted.

It doesn't take much to imagine the consequences of a successful cyber attack. In a future conflict, an adversary unable to match our military supremacy on the battlefield might seek to exploit our computer vulnerabilities here at home. Taking down vital banking systems could trigger a financial crisis. The lack of clean water or functioning hospitals could spark a public health emergency. And as we've seen in past blackouts, the loss of electricity can bring businesses, cities and entire regions to a standstill.

This is the future we have to avoid. That's why my administration has made cybersecurity a priority, including proposing legislation to strengthen our nation's digital defenses. It's why Congress must pass comprehensive cybersecurity legislation.

We all know what needs to happen. We need to make it easier for the government to share threat information so critical-infrastructure companies are better prepared. We need to make it easier for these companies — with reasonable liability protection — to share data and information with government when they're attacked. And we need to make it easier for government, if asked, to help these companies prevent and recover from attacks.

Yet simply sharing more information is not enough. Ultimately, this is about security gaps that have to be filled. To their credit, many of these companies have boosted their cyber defenses. But many others have not, with some lacking even the most basic protection: a good password. That puts public safety and our national security at risk.

July 26, 2012

The American people deserve to know that companies running our critical infrastructure meet basic, commonsense cybersecurity standards, just as they already meet other security requirements. Nuclear power plants must have fences and defenses to thwart a terrorist attack. Water treatment plants must test their water regularly for contaminants. Airplanes must have secure cockpit doors. We all understand the need for these kinds of physical security measures. It would be the height of irresponsibility to leave a digital backdoor wide open to our cyber adversaries.

This approach stays true to our values as a society that cherishes free enterprise and the rights of the individual. Cybersecurity standards would be developed in partnership between government and industry. For the majority of critical infrastructure companies already meeting these standards, nothing more would be expected. Companies needing to upgrade their security would have the flexibility to decide how best to do so using the wide range of innovative products and services available in the marketplace. Moreover, our approach protects the privacy and civil liberties of the American people. Indeed, I will veto any bill that lacks strong privacy and civil-liberties protections.

This is exactly the kind of responsible, collaborative approach to an urgent national-security challenge that Americans expect but that Washington too rarely provides. It reflects the insights and ideas of industry and civil libertarians. It is sponsored by a bipartisan group of senators. It is supported by current and former homeland security, intelligence and defense leaders from both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Today we can see the cyber threat to the networks upon which so much of our modern American lives depend. We have the opportunity — and the responsibility — to take action now and stay a step ahead of our adversaries. For the sake of our national and economic security, I urge the Senate to pass the Cybersecurity Act of 2012 and Congress to send me comprehensive legislation so I can sign it into law.

It's time to strengthen our defenses against this growing danger.

(Mr. Obama is president of the United States.)
